

#### IV. Remarks and Conclusion

In response to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 15-17, under 35 USC §112, 1<sup>st</sup> ¶, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. The Examiner contends that the newly cited Wendling art teaches that only nasal administration is effective. However, reference to the Wedling art, at page 2715, column 1, second full paragraph, the article specifically states that the authors chose to optimize the induction of regulatory T cell activity by administering the peptides intranasally. Further, in the Abstract, the authors state that "in this case parenteral administration ... did not suppress the disease." The article does not states that parenteral administration does not work. The article merely states that, in the case studied by the article, intranasal application was found to optimize the results. Nowhere does it state that intranasal application is the only enabling manner of administration. In fact, the article does specify a decrease in the disease score (see p. 2714, column 2, first paragraph). In light of this argument, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

In regards to the rejection under 35 USC §102(b), Applicants have amended the Claims and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.


The application is believed in a condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request such action. Please call the below undersigned attorney for any assistance in securing allowance of this application or if the Examiner feels that an

interview would further the prosecution of this case. Please charge deposit account number 02-2334 for any required fees.

Date:

8/14/03

Sincerely,

  
William P. Ramey, III  
Reg. No. 44,295

Akzo Nobel Patent Department  
Intervet, Inc.  
405 State Street  
Millsboro, DE 19966  
(302) 933-4034 telephone  
(302) 934-4305 facsimile

**OFFICIAL**